DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 338 562 SP 033 265

AUTHOR Durbin, Diane
TITLE Review of Pre-1980 and Post-1980 Induction Programs. Induction Program Review.
PUB DATE Jul 91
NOTE 76p.; Two figures and two tables have broken type.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Role; *Beginning Teacher Induction; Comparative Analysis; Educational Change; Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; Literature Reviews; Mentors; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Teacher Improvement
IDENTIFIERS Huling Austin (Leslie); Zeichner (Kenneth M)

ABSTRACT

This paper examines 23 induction programs, 11 conducted and reported between 1967-1977 and 12 conducted and reported since the onset of the 1980s educational reform movement. Earlier reviewers of pre-1980 (Zeichner, 1979) and post-1980 (Huling-Austin, 1988) induction programs differ in their beliefs about whether or not research data support the assumption that induction programs aid in the development and retention of beginning teachers. Zeichner, although he acknowledged that induction programs make sense on logical grounds, found empirical evidence to support his designation of assumptions and findings as "highly equivocal." Huling-Austin, on the other hand, believed the programs she reviewed provided research data to support the same assumptions. This review explores whether purposes, activities, and evaluations of induction programs generated by the reform movement reflect developing knowledge and ideas about teachers and teaching that might account for the differing conclusions of earlier reviewers. Approximately 75 references are provided. (Author/LL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED338562

Review of Pre-1980 and Post-1980 Induction Prooram

Diane Durbin

University of Houston

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Durbin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SP 033 265

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

This paper examines 23 induction programs, 11 conducted and reported between 1967-1977 and 12 conducted and reported since the onset of the 1980s educational reform movement. Earlier reviewers of pre-1980 (Zeichner, 1979) and post-1980 (Huling-Austin, 1988) induction programs differ in their beliefs about whether or not research data support the assumption that induction programs aid in the development and retention of beginning teachers. Zeichner, although he acknowledged that induction programs make sense on logical grounds, found empirical evidence to support those assumptions "highly equivocal." Huling-Austin, on the other hand, believed the programs she reviewed provided research data to support the same assumptions. The purpose of this review is to explore whether purposes, activities, and evaluations of induction programs generated by the reform movement reflect developing knowledge and ideas about teachers and teaching that might account for the differing conclusions of the earlier reviewers.

Concerns and Needs of Beginning Teachers

Induction refers to the process by which beginning teachers make the transition from student to practitioner. Although this period for any individual may vary, induction has generally come to mean the introduction to the profession that begins when a teacher accepts his first position and ends with the completion of the first year of service (Tisher, 1982). Although feelings and problems of beginning teachers have been richly documented over many years (Bullough, 1989; McDonald, 1980; Ryan, 1970, 1980; Veenman, 1984), induction programs to ameliorate these problems are a recent development. Most induction efforts date from the publication of the Conant Report (1963), which called local school boards "scandalously remiss" (pp. 70-71) in failing to provide adequate support for beginning teachers. Conant recommended five specific kinds of help, one or more of which are often found in induction programs developed in the 25 years since the publication of The Education of American Teachers. Although interest in induction programs was stimulated by Conant's work, the greatest impetus for such programs has been the educational reform movement of the 1980s. A review of the literature during this time indicates a proliferation of induction activity. While most induction programs reported earlier

were local or university-based, many states have now passed legislation requiring teacher induction programs. Recognition of the importance of induction programs and the growing interest in the topic as a concern for serious research is indicated by the fact that the subject "Beginning Teacher Induction" appeared in ERIC for the first time in 1985, as well as by the number of special journal issues and monographs published on the subject.

Zeichner (1982) identifies three attempts to synthesize the literature on induction programs developed prior to 1980 (Elias, McDonald, Stevenson, Simon, & Fisher, 1980; Johnston, 1981; Zeichner, 1979). Elias et al. conducted a literature review, and a telephone and mail survey to locate structured programs designed to assist beginning teachers. They located 24 programs, both internships (degree-related programs not considered in this paper) and beginning teacher induction programs, which were considered exemplary by educators not involved with the programs. Program evaluation was not a criterion for inclusion in their review. Johnston reviewed knowledge about beginning to teach, including the induction of teachers, in terms of categories proposed by Applegate (1977). He limited his reviews to reports published in professional books, journals, and microfiche in the United

States over the past 50 years. His discussion of induction programs excluded internships, as well as studies for which evaluations were not reported. Zeichner reviewed 11 induction programs reported in ERIC or professional journals, all of which came after the Conant report, used one or more of the support elements he suggested, and for which there was some evaluation data. One of these, the NASSP Project in the Induction of Beginning Teachers (Hunt, 1968), was specifically designed to incorporate Conant's suggestions.

According to Zeichner (1982), these reviews indicate that there were few induction programs reported in the literature prior to the current interest in the topic, and fewer still for which there were evaluation data. Furthermore, many of the evaluations that were reported provided no real information on the effectiveness of the program. Many evaluations were measures of participant satisfaction; in general, participants reported they were helped by the programs. Other measures of the effectiveness of induction programs, including improved teacher performance or student achievement, improved attitude of teacher or student, job satisfaction, or retention of beginning teachers in the profession, did not indicate significant results. While the consensus seemed to be that

induction programs can have a significant impact on the development of beginning teachers, there was little empirical data to support this feeling (Johnston, 1981; Zeichner, 1979, 1982).

Subsequent to Zeichner's (1982) report, there have been a number of additional attempts to synthesize the induction literature. Huling-Austin (1987), for example, in attempting to "support the assumption that teacher induction programs make a difference" (p. 1), reported on 17 studies conducted since 1977 which focus on beginning teachers in an induction program and for which data were systematically collected and analyzed. Contrary to Zeichner, Huling-Austin believes her synthesis presents research data to support the assumption that induction programs can make a difference in the development of beginning teachers. She believes evaluations show induction programs to be successful in achieving five goals she identified as common to most programs.

Ishler (1988) reviewed induction programs in an effort to provide insight into how findings from successful induction programs might be used in Texas. The Maryland (Maryland SDOE and Research for Better Schools, Inc., 1987; Champion, Newcombe, Meister, and Austin, 1988) and Illinois (Barger, 1986b) State Boards of Education conducted similar

reviews for use in those states. In addition, they also reviewed induction practices already in place in school districts in their states (Barger, 1986a; Meister, 1987). Also, Teacher Induction: A New Beginning (Brooks, 1987), presents what is probably the broadest view to date of induction activities at all levels, including state departments of education, institutions of higher education, and local education agencies.

This paper examines 23 induction programs, 11 conducted and reported between 1967-1977 and 12 conducted and reported since the onset of the 1980s educational reform movement. Because earlier reviewers of pre-1980 (Zeichner, 1979) and post-1980 (Huling-Austin, 1988) induction programs differ in their beliefs about whether or not research data support the assumption that induction programs aid in the development and retention of beginning teachers, the purpose of this review is to explore whether purposes, activities, and evaluations of induction programs generated by the reform movement reflect developing knowledge and ideas abut teachers and teaching that might account for the differing conclusions.

Induction Programs Selected for Review in This Paper

In selecting induction programs for review, I found Zeichner's (1979) definitions of beginning teacher and beginning teacher induction program appropriate. These definitions are:

> Beginning teacher - One who has completed all pre-service training requirements (including student teaching); has been granted [at least] a provisional certificate; is in the employ of a school district; has generally the same type and degree of responsibilities assigned more experienced teachers; and is either in his or her first year of service to the profession or to a particular school district.
>
> Beginning teacher program - A planned program which is intended to provide some systematic and sustained assistance specifically to beginning teachers for at least one school year. The persons providing the support are specifically assigned that responsibility.

There were several additional criteria for program selection. Because I wondered if purposes had changed, if evaluations were better or more complete, or if interpretations of findings differed in pre- and post-1980 induction programs, I wanted to examine an approximately equal number of from each period. Furthermore, I limited programs to those developed and implemented in this country since the publication of the Conant Report (1963), although it was not necessary that they be currently operative, and for which evaluation data were reported.

I located induction programs for review by a thorough manual and electronic search of the ERIC database (including RIE and Current Journals in Education), a less thorough search of Education Index, and through bibliographies in books, journal articles, and papers. I decided to use the 11 programs reviewed by Zeichner (1979) for the period prior to 1980. I had accepted his definition of beginning teacher and beginning teacher program, as well as his requirement that there be evaluation data, and most of the programs he reviewed were also reviewed by Johnston (1981). Zeichner described the programs in considerable detail; however, I located the original paper or article describing each program in an attempt to get more complete information.

After reading articles or papers on every post-1980 program I could locate, I selected for review 12 programs for which there was both a thorough description and at least some evaluation data. An indication of the increased activity at the state level since the onset of the current educational reform movement is the number of induction programs mandated by state legislatures. Although there were pilot programs mandated by state boards of education among those reviewed by Zeichner (1979), none were mandated by law. This increase in state-mandated activity was the

only major difference in pre- and post-1980 induction programs.

For both the pre- and post-1980 periods, some programs which appeared worthwhile or promising were eliminated from the review for various reasons. The most common reason was lack of evaluation data (Lawrence, 1985; Locke, 1987; Weber, 1987). One pre-1980 program for which there was extensive evaluation data (Oates, 1971) was eliminated because it was designed for non-credentialed beginning teachers. Data showed that those who participated in the program were more open and understanding of children at the end of their first year than those who were in two control groups of credentialed beginning teachers. However, the treatment group was less flexible in the teaching role than the control groups, which the researcher attributed to deficiencies in curriculum and methodology for non-credentialed beginners. A post-1980 program in Wake County, South Carolina, which appeared to be very promising in that it provided extensive training for potential mentors, was eliminated from the review because published reports (McNair, 1987; Thies-Sprinthall, 1986) focused on only that aspect of the program. The same was true of a New York City program (Gold and Pepin, 1987; Sacks and Wilcox, 1987) in which retired teachers served as mentors for

beginning teachers. A number of programs discussed in Huling-Austin's (1988) and Ishler's (1988) reviews could not be examined because they have not yet been reported in professional publications or in ERIC.

Figure 1 lists the programs selected for review in this study. Following Zeichner's form, the programs are listed in the order that information on them was published.

Insert Figure 1 About Here

Table 1 summarizes both pre-1980 and post-1980 in terms of the support elements identified by Zeichner. In the

---

Insert Table 1 About Here

---

sections that follow, the purposes, major findings, and evaluations of these 23 programs are reviewed. Following a discussion of the major elements reviewed, I will conclude with recommendations for development of future programs.

Purposes of Induction Programs

The purposes of induction programs, as reflected by those chosen for this review, are diverse and often unclearly stated. In some cases, purposes can only be inferred from statements about the needs of beginning teachers or from descriptions of program components. In many of the programs reviewed, developers appear to regard induction as an instrumental activity to help beginning teachers master effective teaching practices. Many programs also have stated goals or purposes that appear to be derived from sociological or psychological orientations. However, program developers rarely identify the theoretical basis for their efforts. Frameworks used in earlier reviews to categorize purposes for induction programs are helpful in clarifying the purposes of these programs.

The Maryland State Department of Education (1987), recognized five general purposes for induction programs included in its literature review. These programs were intended to (1) address perceived needs of beginning teachers, (2) improve teaching skills, (3) integrate beginning teachers into the school community, (4) resolve predictable concerns of beginning teachers, and (5) foster adult development. These general areas were collapsed into three perspectives based on research on effective teaching

(purposes one and two), teacher socialization (purpose three), and teacher development (purposes four and five). In addition, the purposes address categories of problems identified by participants in the Oklahoma Entry Year Assistance Program (Godley, Klug, and Wilson, 1985) as translating knowledge into practice, work socialization, and personal characteristics.

Huling-Austin (1988) identified five commonly accepted goals for teacher induction programs and used them as a focus for her synthesis of research on teacher induction programs. The goals are (1) to improve teaching performance, (2) to transmit the culture of the system to beginning teachers, (3) to promote the personal and professional well-being of beginning teachers, (4) to increase the retention of promising beginning teachers during the induction years, and (5) to satisfy mandated requirements related to induction and certification. Huling-Austin believes there is research data to support the success of induction programs in achieving each of these goals. The first three goals correspond to the purposes identified in the Maryland (1988) review; the goals of retention and compliance with mandated requirements are in addition to those mentioned in the Maryland study.

Table 2 shows how purposes of the 23 induction programs reviewed for this paper correspond with those identified by the Maryland (1988) and Huling-Austin (1988) reviews.

Insert Table 2 About Here

Improve Teaching Performance

A primary purpose of every induction program reviewed here was to improve teaching performance. In most cases, this purpose was stated; in a few, it could be inferred from descriptions of activities. For instance, in the pre-1980 Hawaii Beginning Teacher Development Program (Noda, 1968), the "foremost aim of the program is to assist the beginning teacher in his professional and personal growth at his point of entry into the profession" (p. 63). The assistance described and the examples of growth presented illustrate improvement of teaching performance.

Teaching performance was measured through classroom observations of treatment group (induction) and control group (non-induction) beginning teachers in three pre-1980 induction programs. In Alabama (Alabama State Department of Education, 1974), teacher competency was measured on the ETS/UAB Instrument, developed by the Educational Testing Service and the University of Alabama-Birmingham, and on

three instruments developed to measure proficiency in professional behavior, managerial tasks, and planning-instructional strategies. In Washington State (Hite, Garrison, & Killian, 1966), teacher competency on 10 behaviors was measured by the Stanford Teacher Competence Appraisal Guide, a checklist designed to judge the performance of a classroom teacher. In New York City (Honigman, 1978), teacher competency on 10 behaviors was measured by the Multidimensional Analysis of Classroom Interaction, an instrument designed for coding and quantifying teacher/pupil interactions. In the Alabama and Washington State programs, there were no statistically significant differences between treatment and control group teachers. In New York City, there was a statistically significant difference between treatment and control teachers on one of five behaviors; however, for five behaviors for which means of control teachers were higher, tests of statistical significance were not performed. In Alabama, there were statistically significant differences in principals' ratings of treatment and control teachers on professional behavior, managerial tasks, and planning-instructional strategies; in New York City, although principals' ratings of treatment teachers on 10 items were higher than ratings of control teachers, the

differences were not statistically significant. The Alabama program was the only pre-1980 induction effort that measured differences in student achievement; there were none. In the Alabama and New York programs, there was an attempt to measure student attitude, which may reflect student performance. In neither of these programs were there significant differences in attitude between students whose teachers participated in induction programs and students whose teachers did not.

The same results on classroom observation measures are present in the post-1980 programs. Huling-Austin (1988), in suggesting that induction programs may lead to improvement of teaching, quotes Elsner (1984) as saying that first-year teachers in Oklahoma's induction program made significant progress in planning skills, handling class discussions, preparation of unit and lesson plans, management of discipline problems, and the ability to teach or train others. Data were collected from members of the Entry Year Assistance Committees, including entry-year teachers, teacher consultants, school administrators and higher education representatives, who were asked to rate the beginning teacher's knowledge, skills, and competencies in 10 areas at the beginning and end of the school year. However, Elsner also says (p. 7) that it is debatable how

much of the improvement in entry-year teachers competencies can be attributed to Entry Year Assistance Committees. This statement is convincingly corroborated by results of studies of both the Oklahoma (Crawford, McBee, and Watson, 1984) and Florida (Gunter, 1985) induction programs.

During the first year of the Oklahoma program, teachers who graduated from college after January 31, 1982, were required to participate in the Entry Year Assistance Program during their initial year of teaching, while beginning teachers who graduated on or before that date were assigned to a teacher consultant (mentor) for the initial year. Similarly, in Florida beginning teachers who applied for certification prior to July 1, 1982, were exempt from the initial year of the Beginning Teacher Assistance Program, while those who applied after that date were required to participate. In both cases, the result was a unique opportunity to take advantage of naturally occurring treatment and control groups to study the effects of the state induction program. In Oklahoma, 20 pairs of carefully matched experimental and control teachers were studied; in Florida, 77 pairs of carefully matched teachers were studied. In both states, teaching performance of experimental and control teachers was compared by classroom observation and principals' ratings. In Oklahoma, student

achievement of the two groups was compared; in Florida, experimental and control teachers' confidence in their ability to perform satisfactorily on the teaching evaluation instrument was compared. There were few significant differences in measures of teaching effectiveness between the two Oklahoma groups. Teachers participating in the Entry Year Assistance Program were more interactive with students, somewhat more oriented toward academic content, and had higher rates of one-to-one contacts with students. However, students of teachers in the two groups did not differ in achievement. In Florida, there were no significant differences between the two groups in ratings on the Florida Performance Measurement System nor in teachers' confidence in their ability to perform the required competencies. In neither state were there differences in principals' ratings of beginning teachers in the two groups.

Two post-1980 programs measured improved teaching by comparing pre- and post-treatment group responses with pre- and post-control group responses. In Washington State (Brouillet, 1987), there was no significant difference at the beginning of the year between treatment and control group beginners in their perceptions of their own degree of competency in teaching strategies. By the end of the year, however, the number of treatment teachers who perceived

themselves quite/extremely competent in teaching strategies was significantly higher than the number of control teachers. Similarly, in Project Credit (Henry, 1988b), pre- and post-treatment group perceptions of ideal and self teaching attributes were compared with a set of pre- and post-control group perceptions. Analysis of responses showed significantly more favorable changes for the treatment group on 33 variables, similar changes on 14 variables, and more favorable changes for the control group on one variable. However, in the post-1980 New York City Mentor Teacher Internship Program (Guerrero & Goldberg, 1988) there was no statistically significant difference between students of teachers who did and did not participate in the program on achievement test scores in reading and mathematics.

While perceptions of treatment and control teachers in two post-1980 programs (Brouillet, 1987; Henry, 1988a, 1988b) indicate that induction programs lead to improved teaching, other data gathered by classroom observers in both pre- and post-1980 programs do not verify that finding. Nor do other measures of improved teaching, such as student achievement or student attitude.

Teacher Socialization

Teacher socialization is frequently a purpose for induction programs. However, this purpose is often not explicitly stated, but must be inferred from statements about the importance of learning about the school, motivation, or job satisfaction .

McDonald (1980) identifies adapting to the social system of the school as one of two major tasks to be mastered if a beginning teacher is to become competent. The other, of course, is mastering the skills of teaching. However, Huling-Austin (1988) describes what she calls the goal of transmitting the culture of the system as less prevalent in many programs than the other four goals she identifies. She explains her statement by saying that while many programs recognize that "one program function is to 'socialize' beginning teachers and to familiarize them with the workplace norms, they fall far short of defining and transmitting the culture of the system" (p.15). I have accepted the more limited definition of teacher socialization in identifying purposes. As Huling-Austin suggests, however, developers of many programs reviewed here appear to have given little thought to articulating the school's norms and values, how to transmit them to the

beginning teacher, or how to help that teacher adapt to them.

There were exceptions, however. In particular, three of the pre-1980 programs were structured to meet socialization needs of beginning teachers within specific contexts. For instance, the purpose of the Wheeling High School (Illinois) Teacher In-Service Training Emphasizing the Affective Dimension (Johnson, 1969) was to help teachers focus on their own behavior and adapt to school norms that valued total personality development of each child. In addition, one of the purposes of the Supportive Training for Inexperienced and New Teachers (STINT) program in New York City (Honigman, 1970), was to help beginning teachers function more sensitively in an urban ghetto classroom. Finally, among the stated objectives of the South Texas New Teacher Orientation Project (Dooley, 1970) was development of understanding and appreciation of the responsibilities, gratifications, problems and pressures of teaching deprived children.

Evaluation data for these programs led developers to believe they were successful in achieving their purposes. In the Wheeling program, the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory, which predicts how well a teacher will get along with pupils in interpersonal relationships and how well

satisfied he will be with teaching as a vocation, was given as a pre- and post-test. Post-test scores were slightly, though not significantly, higher than pre-test scores. This was seen as an indication of success in meeting goals since teachers generally score lower with each year of experience. In New York, the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire was administered to treatment and control groups in order to compare their attitudes about their jobs and the professional setting in which they worked. Treatment group teachers' responses to most factors measured by the instrument, including a global measure of teacher morale which included all of the factors, were significantly more favorable than those of the control group. In South Texas, achievement of program purposes was measured by gathering data from participants on a five-point Lickert scale. Possible responses ranged from Unable to Evaluate (1) to Total Achievement of Objective (5). For all project objectives, the rating was (4), Noticeable Achievement of Objective.

Among the post-1980 programs, the Model Teacher Induction Project (Barnes & Huling-Austin, 1984; Huling-Austin, Putman, & Galvez-Hjornevik, 1985; Smith & Huling-Austin, 1985), Richardson New Teacher Induction Program (Brooks, 1986a, 1986b), Virginia Colleague Teacher Project (Wildman, Niles, Magliaro, McLaughlin, and Drill,

1987), and New York City Mentor Teacher Internship Program (Guerrero and Goldberg, 1988) placed particular emphasis on socialization goals. In each of these projects, success in achieving teacher socialization was measured primarily through analysis of questionnaires, journals, and interviews.

Smith and Huling Austin (1985) identified the facilitator role of the support teacher - orienting the new teacher to the school, making frequent contacts with the new teacher, and acting as a go-between for the new teacher and the administration - as an important type of assistance to first-year teachers. Results of an end-of-year questionnaire and interview in Richardson indicated that 61% of beginning teachers and 75% of returning teachers believed the special pre-school orientation enhanced their motivation (Brooks, 1986b). A major goal of the Virginia Colleague Teacher Project was examination of conditions under which beginning teachers develop productive collegial relationships with experienced teachers. Beginning teachers in that project mentioned the workplace second only to instruction (107 and 116 times, respectively) as a major concern during their first year, and consultation with colleagues as the most frequent way to solve all problems. In the New York City Program (Guerrero and Goldberg, 1988),

70 of 73 interns said the program would help them be more confident, build relationships with peers, and make them able to give students more.

In summary, developers of both pre- and post-1980 programs in which teacher socialization was a primary purpose presented qualitative or quantitative data to indicate that the program was successful in achieving its purpose.

Teacher Development

As with induction program purposes associated with teacher socialization, those reflecting teacher development are frequently unclearly articulated in program descriptions. Most often, vague references are made to beginning teachers' personal and professional development. Rarely do descriptions offer rationales which indicate that program purposes or activities are based on any of the developmental theories mentioned by Veenman (1984). Although no single theory has been accepted, the general hypothesis of these theorists that teachers pass through developmental stages has been upheld. The theories suggest that beginning teachers develop at different rates and that induction programs should provide both personal and professional support which will meet their emerging needs.

There are programs that provide a model for incorporating knowledge about teacher development. For instance, from the pre-1980 programs, the Wheeling Program (Johnson, 1969), was partly based on the idea that teachers develop along a continuum from a managerial level to a creative level, and that they must be able to assess their own development in order to aid the student in his/her development. The Wilmette Program for Beginning Teachers: An Individualized Approach to In-service Education (Wilmette Public Schools, 1969), combined pre-school orientation and eight Saturday morning group workshops based on common needs of beginning teachers with a highly individualized program based on the emerging needs of each teacher. Individual activities, which in some cases were self-directed, included eight half days of release time for workshops, visitation, demonstration teaching, and consultation. At intervals throughout their first year, teachers responded to a "Survey of Teacher Attitudes and Needs" designed to ascertain emerging individual needs. According to the report, developers planned to evaluate the program by determining professional growth and change at the end of the first, second, and third years of teaching; these results were not reported.

Among the post-1980 programs reviewed, the Model Teacher Induction Project (Barnes and Huling-Austin, 1984; Huling-Austin, Putman, and Galvez-Hjornevik, 1985) used the Stages of Concern questionnaire to determine emerging needs of beginning teachers in August, December, and May. Results showed group concerns were fairly predictable, but individual profiles indicated "diversity both in the types of concerns experienced at a given time and the intensity of these concerns" (Huling-Austin, Putman, and Galvez-Hjornevik, 1985, p. 31). This was taken as an indication that induction programs should not be totally preplanned, but should permit the emerging needs of the participants to determine the content, sequence, and pace of the program. In the APS/UNM Teacher Induction Project, Odell (1986, 1988) used a developmental framework to guide a functional approach for gathering data on types of assistance asked for by beginning teachers. Consistent with group findings in the Model Teacher Induction Project, Odell found two primary needs of beginning teachers were to obtain fundamental information about the school district and to obtain resources and materials pertinent to the information to be taught. However, as need for system information decreased, beginning teachers wanted more help with teaching strategies and the instructional process.

Some programs, such as the Richardson (Texas) Independent School District New Teacher Induction Program (Brooks, 1986a, 1986b; Hirsh & Brooks, 1986) and the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater Teacher Induction Program (Theune & Varah, 1983; Varah, 1985; Varah, Theune, and Parker, 1986), recognize the importance of teacher development in statements of purpose and through activities. However, reports of these studies do not present information on whether or how beginning teachers' stages of development were determined or used in developing program content.

Retention

Five pre-1980 and seven post-1980 programs name retention of teachers as a goal of the program or discuss it as a major concern for schools.

Two of the pre-1980 programs attempted to measure retention. In the New York City Supportive Training Program for Inexperienced and New Teachers (STINT) (Honigman, 1970), although the program operated throughout the city, treatment and control groups were drawn from seven STINT and seven non-STINT schools which were matched on population density, geographic proximity, and similarity of racial and ethnic distribution of students. There were 48 teachers from STINT schools in the treatment group, and 49 teachers from non-STINT schools in the control group. There was no

significant difference in retention between these two groups; however, developers believed the small number of teachers in the sample made generalization impossible. They noted that in one "highly turbulent" (p. 36) district, not one of 180 STINT teachers either resigned or requested a transfer. However, because teacher-turnover data for the New York City school system was not available, meaningful comparisons could not be made. In South Texas (Dooley, 1970), on one survey instrument, 72% of the beginning teachers in the program said they wished to return to their present position. In another measure, the six districts involved in the program indicated a 45 to 71% retention rate for beginning teachers, an overall improvement of 47% over the average of the preceding three years. In Alabama (Blackburn, 1977), although retention was not a program goal, only four of 100 induction teachers did not teach the following year; 20 of 100 non-induction teachers did not teach.

Four post-1980 programs attempted to measure retention. In the first year of the Washington State pilot program (Brouillet, 1987), 70% of both treatment and control teachers were "likely" or "extremely likely" to remain in teaching. This was consistent with Gunter's (1985) findings about teachers in Florida's Beginning Teacher Assistance

Program. There was no significant difference between intentions of treatment and control teachers in the Florida study to remain in the profession. However, treatment group teachers were significantly more likely than control group teachers to leave their present position. In the New York City Mentor Teacher Internship Program (Guerrero & Goldberg, 1988), 80% of 73 interns said they would return to their present assignment, while in Indiana (Henry, 1988a, 1988b), where 26.5% of beginning teachers drop out by the end of the second year, all 20 teachers in Project CREDIT indicated they would return.

Information on retention is not conclusive. Many of the programs made no attempt to measure retention. In other programs, beginning teachers reported they planned to remain in teaching. Except for Alabama (Blackburn, 1977), in programs where treatment and control groups were compared (Honigman, 1970; Gunter, 1985; Brouillet, 1987), there was no significant difference in retention. However, numbers in the comparison groups were not sufficient for generalization. There were no reports of retention over time.

Meet Mandated Requirements

None of the pre-1980 induction programs were mandated by state legislatures. However, statewide pilot programs in

Washington State (Hite, 1968; Hite, Garrison, & Killian, 1966), Hawaii (Noda, 1968), and Alabama (Alabama State Department of Education, 1974; Blackburn, 1977; Blackburn & Crandall, 1975) were mandated by the Department of Education in those states. Barger (1986b) reports that because the program was very expensive, Alabama decided to discontinue funding and that current induction efforts focus on placing new teachers in ideal situations.

Of the post-1980 programs, the Florida Beginning Teacher Assistance Program (Gunter, 1985; Hoffman et al., 1985; Sher, 1982; etc.), the Oklahoma Entry Year Assistance Program (Combs (Ed.), 1985; Elsner, 1984; Hoffman et al., 1985; etc.), and the Virginia Beginning Teacher Assistance Program (Caldwell, 1986; Medley, Rosenblum, & Vance, 1989) were mandated by the state legislature. All beginning teachers in those states were required to participate. The Virginia Colleague Teacher Project (Wildman, Niles, Magliaro, McLaughlin, & Drill, 1987; Wildman, Niles, Magliaro, & McLaughlin, 1989) was a research component of the Virginia program, and was not a requirement for all teachers. These programs are representative of the increasing number of state-mandated programs reported in the literature. The Washington, D.C., Intern-Mentor Teacher

Program (District of Columbia Public Schools, 1985, 1987) was mandated by the Board of Education.

The mandated programs were the only ones included in this review which were intended to provide both assistance and evaluation. The implications of combining these functions are discussed later in this review. Of the pre-1980 programs, Hawaii (Noda, 1968) required successful completion, determined by the principal's evaluation with input from the supervisor of the induction program, for permanent certification. All of the mandated post-1980 programs had successful completion determined by an evaluation as a requirement for certification. Barnes (1985), who believes that very few teachers are denied certification, states that "people in the field" perceived the purpose of the two state-mandated programs in the Teacher Induction Study to be weeding out incompetent teachers. However, none of the beginning teachers in that study (N = 1,000), even one whose competency was questioned, were denied certification.

In summary, although participants believe teacher induction programs are helpful, there is no overwhelming evidence that they are successful in achieving their purposes. In the first place, purposes are often unclearly stated. In the second place, evaluation measures are often

not appropriate to determine if purposes have been achieved. Participants perceive that induction programs improve teaching performance; this perception has not been conclusively verified by empirical evidence. In programs where the meaning of teacher socialization is adequately defined, both qualitative and quantitative data seem to indicate that this purpose can be achieved. In the few programs where teacher development is adequately defined and measured, data indicate that programs can and should be designed to meet developing needs of beginning teachers. Although there is some indication that induction programs may result in short-term retention, there are no studies that show long-term effects on retention. Finally, although mandated programs are intended to provide both assistance and evaluation, there is no evidence that they make a significant difference in teaching performance or in the elimination of incompetent teachers.

Major Findings from Induction Programs

In addition to findings about the purposes of induction programs, I have identified other findings frequently discussed in reports of both pre- and post-1980 induction programs. These might best be characterized as findings about elements which lead to success in achieving the purposes of induction programs. These findings are discussed in the following section.

Mentors

Mentors have been called by various other titles, including buddy teacher, colleague teacher, support teacher, and teacher consultant. In a study of induction practices by Marshall (1982), 289 beginning teachers ranked 15 induction practices according to their degree of helpfulness. Each of the first four practices rated most helpful embodied the mentor concept.

Findings from both pre- and post-1980 induction programs reviewed here confirm the importance of this role. Of the pre-1980 programs, six included the assignment of an experienced teacher to assist the beginning teacher; 10 of the 12 post-1980 programs employed the mentor concept. In the Virginia Beginning Teacher Program (Caldwell, 1986), which did not include a mentor, the research component of

that program, the Virginia Colleague Teacher Project (Wildman, Niles, Magliaro, McLaughlin, & Drill, 1987), specifically studied collegial relationships between beginning and experienced teachers. Typically, beginning teachers found the mentor the most positive and significant aspect of their induction program (Combs, 1985; Huling-Austin, Putman, & Galvez-Hjornevik, 1985; Swanson, 1968). Beginning teachers in two state-mandated induction programs (Hoffman, 1985) perceived the mentor to be "a significant positive force in affecting classroom practices" (p. 129), while the evaluation component was perceived as insignificant. Both Hoffman (1985) and Odell (1986) found that the influence of the mentor increased as the year progressed.

Roles of the mentors varied considerably. In some programs, one mentor assisted several teachers (District of Columbia Public Schools, 1985, 1987; Guerrero and Goldberg, 1988; McGinnis, 1968; Noda, 1968; Odell, 1986). Mentor roles ranged from providing informal assistance within general guidelines (Huling-Austin, Putman, and Galvez-Hjornevik, 1985; Wilmette Public Schools, 1969), to observing classrooms and providing follow-up assistance (Marashio, 1971; McGinnis, 1968; Odell, 1986; etc.), to participating in evaluation and/or recommendation for

certification (District of Columbia Public Schools, 1985, 1987; King, 1988; Noda, 1968; Sher, 1982; etc.).

Mentors gave various kinds of help to beginning teachers. Swanson (1968) found in the NASSP project that the five types of assistance most helpful to beginning teachers "are all dependent upon the presence of the co-operating teacher" (p. 82). Smith and Huling-Austin (1985) found they gave help as facilitators, supporters, and experts. Hoffman et al. (1985) and Wildman, Niles, Magaliaro, McLaughlin, and Drill (1987) both identified the major kinds of help provided by mentors as cognitive (practical or informational) and affective. Hoffman et al. believed practical help was of primary importance. This was confirmed by Odell (1986), who measured the help needed and received by beginning teachers in three ways. She recorded the kinds of questions they asked, observed the kind of help given by their mentors, and asked them what kind of support they needed. By all three measures, their instructional needs were greatest. Nevertheless, comments by beginning teachers reveal that mentors are valued as much for emotional and psychological support, and for help in understanding institutional policies and norms, as for instructional support (Brouillet, 1987, 1988; Guerrero and Goldberg, 1988; Hoffman et al., 1985). Mentors seem to

share this attitude with beginning teachers. Stern and Shepherd (1986), for instance, report that Shepherd and Gallaher found that teacher consultants in Oklahoma defined success for the beginning teacher in terms of membership in the institution rather than in terms of classroom performance.

Although the importance of the mentor is recognized in both pre- and post-1980 programs, more of the recent programs utilize this support element. In addition, the role of the mentor is more richly documented by the interview technique used frequently to gather data in the post-1980 program evaluations. Interviews were used to gather data in only one pre-1980 program.

Time

Conant (1963) recommended a reduction of one class in teaching load for both beginning teachers and their mentors. This was initially done in the NASSP project designed to test his recommendations. By the third and final year of the project, budgetary constraints had eroded the amount of release time provided (Swanson, 1968). In fact, one district was unable to provide any release time. According to Swanson, the results were not promising. Very little success was achieved when induction activities were scheduled before or after school; weekly group meetings held during common planning periods were more successful. Swanson points out that induction activities are necessarily limited under such conditions and must be immediately relevant for the beginner in order to sustain interest. Furthermore, she emphasizes that "significant gains in terms of teacher growth cannot be expected" (p. 80).

In another pre-1980 program (Hite, Garrison, and Killian, 1966), three treatment groups were given intensive supervision and a 25% reduction in teaching load. For two groups, one period of teaching was eliminated; activities of the two groups during their release time were different. Reduction for the third group was in the form of fewer pupils, although the number of periods was not reduced. A

control group of beginning teachers was not given a reduced load. There was no significant difference among the groups in selected aspects of classroom behavior or in attitude toward teaching. However, there was a pronounced trend toward use of more effective teaching behaviors among all treatment groups, with "relatively large percentage differences between mean scores" (p. 71) which the project staff did not believe resulted from pure chance. These differences were maintained one year later (Hite, 1968).

Among the post-1980 induction programs, only the beginning teachers in the New York City Mentor Teacher Internship Program (Guerrero and Goldberg, 1988) had a comparable amount of release time. That program was one of 24 pilot programs in which the state mandated that 20 percent of beginning teachers' classroom time and 10 percent per intern (most mentors had two) of mentors' in-class time be covered by substitutes while they took part in induction activities. Many of those involved in the program, particularly principals, found time away from students the major drawback of the program. Nevertheless, the beginning teachers found visits to other classrooms and from mentors, made possible by the release time, among the most positive aspects of the program. Beginners identified watching other teachers teach as the "most helpful" induction activity.

Such a large amount of release time was not available in most programs. As a result, sufficient time for induction activities was a frequently mentioned problem. For instance, in both Florida and Oklahoma, mentors said they did not have time to properly fulfill their mandated duties (Hoffman et al., 1985; Crawford, McBee, and Watson, 1985). Barbee and Finley (1985) found that many of Oklahoma's Teacher Consultants did not spend the required 72 hours of time, which by law is in addition to the observation and committee time, in providing assistance to the beginning teacher. In Washington State (Brouillet, 1987), where the state provided money to cover release time, 74% of beginning teachers "never" or "only once or twice" observed a mentor teacher's classroom, while 55% of the program mentors "never" or "only once or twice" observed their beginning teacher. Other programs did not offer release time at all, but scheduled seminars and workshops after school or on Saturdays (Henry, 1988b; Hirsh & Brooks, 1986).

Role of the Principal

Descriptions of objectives and activities of either pre- or post-1980 induction programs do not commonly emphasize a major role for the principal. However, program

evaluations from both periods reveal the importance of that role.

For instance, in South Texas (Dooley, 1970), the program was found to be more effective when the principal and/or assistant principal showed an interest, while a major cause for problems with the program was insufficient follow-up on program objectives and activities by principals. Both the NASSP (Swanson, 1968) and Wilmette (Wilmette Public Schools, 1969) evaluations indicated that when the principal exhibits support and leadership in selecting and working with mentors and in utilizing other resources to help the beginning teacher, professional development of that teacher will be positively affected.

Among the post-1980 programs, the importance of the principal is shown in evaluation of the Richardson (Texas) New Teacher Induction Program (Brooks, 1986b), where the program structure made the principal the primary agent in induction. In some schools the principal performed the role that was expected; however, about half the time it was apparently delegated to someone else or neglected. In these schools, induction activities were not perceived as particularly helpful.

While the mentor was seen by beginning teachers as the most positive element in an induction program, their

perception of the principal's role was less positive. This was true in state-mandated programs in which the principal was given a significant role by law (Combs, 1985; Hoffman et al., 1985; Stern & Wisley, 1985), as well as in programs where the principal's role was not a primary focus of the program (Dooley, 1970; Brouillet, 1987). In Oklahoma and Florida, when contacts with principals were positive, they "were interpreted and valued by beginning teachers as approval and acceptance by the primary authority figure in the school" (Hoffman et al., 1985, p. 103). Just as important, are principals' perceptions of the induction programs in their schools. In these programs, principals' perceptions toward induction activities were more negative than those of any other group. Principals believed they were not properly informed about the programs, did not have enough say in selection of mentors, and that release time for beginning teachers and/or mentors disrupted their schools (Brouillet, 1987, 1988; Dooley, 1970; Guerrero and Goldberg, 1988; etc.).

Observation

Included here are observations of and by experienced teachers and peers. Beginning teachers frequently describe this as a helpful activity (Guerrero and Goldberg, 1988; Huling-Austin, Putman, & Galvez-Hjornevik, 1985; McGinnis,

1968); frequently these observations do not occur even when they are provided for in program design (Brouillet, 1987, 1988) or mandate (Barbee and Finley, 1985). Data from both the Model Teacher Induction Project (Huling-Austin, Putman, & Galvez-Hjornevik, 1985) and the Washington, D.C. Intern-Mentor Teacher Program (District of Columbia Public Schools, 1987) indicate that either a classroom observation or demonstration lesson and follow-up conference require about four hours. For this reason, teachers in the Model Teacher Induction Project were observed by researchers rather than their mentors; mentors in the Washington project had 100% release time.

Program Structure

Andrews (1986) investigated components of teacher induction programs in five countries to identify the academic programs and organizational structures underlying induction activities in those countries. He identified five paradigms underlying the structure of induction programs. These are illustrated in Figure 2. Most of the programs

---

Insert Figure 2 About Here

---

reviewed here fall within Andrews' collegial or formalized mentor-protege paradigms, although some have elements of the

self-directing professional model (Wilmette (Ill.) Public Schools, 1969). The collegial model is an informal, low-cost assistance-based model in which socialization activities are inherent, while the mentor-protege model formalizes the collegial model. The mandated programs, however, exemplify paradigm four, the competency-based model, in which accountability for meeting minimum standards is a goal.

One program reviewed here (Klug, 1988) was a study specifically structured to examine the relative effectiveness of loosely structured and highly structured induction programs. Klug's definition of loosely structured programs encompasses Andrews' collegial and formal mentor protege paradigms. Beginning teachers in the loosely structured program were assigned a buddy teacher. The definition of a highly structured program corresponds to Andrews' competency-based paradigm. Beginning teachers in the highly structured program were assigned an assistance committee which carried out an induction program based on Oklahoma's mandated Entry Year Assistance Program. The goal of both the loosely and highly structured induction programs was to support and assist the beginning teacher in developing technical skill and in personal and professional development. Qualitative data analysis showed that

participants in both models felt a highly structured program with formalized goals, specific activities, and definite meeting times was less confusing and more effective than an informal program. Mentors in the highly structured program spent three times as many hours with their beginning teachers than did those in the loosely structured program. Participants believed the highly structured program was more stressful and emphasized the need to accentuate assistance rather than evaluation and the necessity for care in selection of mentors. Quantitative data analysis showing whether or not one model was superior in developing technical skill was not complete when the study was published. However, results from a similar study in Oklahoma (Crawford, McBee, and Watson, 1984) showed few differences in measures of teaching effectiveness between the groups.

Program developers from both pre- and post-1980 believe findings show programs should be flexible enough to allow for the various kinds of support beginning teachers find helpful. Induction program components beginning teachers have found helpful include preschool orientation; preplanned sessions on common needs of beginning teachers; sessions based on emergent needs of individuals or groups of beginners; and support sessions in which beginners interact

with one another with the guidance of an experienced facilitator (Brooks, 1986; Henry, 1988; Huling-Austin, 1987; McGinnis, 1968; Odell, 1986; Swanson, 1968).

Evaluation versus Assistance

Associated with the trend toward mandated induction programs is the trend toward evaluation of the beginning teacher's performance as a major element of the program. In the pre-1980 programs reviewed here, only one (Noda, 1968) was intended for both evaluation and assistance; the other 10 programs were intended to assist the beginning teacher as he or she made the transition into teaching. Of the 12 post-1980 programs, the four mandated programs had strong evaluation components. Three were state programs; one was mandated in the District of Columbia. Although these programs reported they intended to provide both assistance and evaluation, the assessment component was clearly a major goal.

However, findings from both pre- and post-1980 programs indicate that goals such as retention and professional development may not be well served by an evaluative program. Among the pre-1980 programs, several reports made clear that much of the success of the program depended on the non-evaluative role of the mentor and the confidentiality of information shared between the mentor and beginning teacher

(Marashio, 1971; McGinnis, 1968; Swanson, 1968). In the post-1980 Model Teacher Induction Project (Huling-Austin, Putman, & Galvez-Hjornevik, 1985), a mentor consulted an administrator about a problem related to the beginning teacher. The beginning teacher believed her trust had been violated, and the support teacher reported a "shield" (p. 33) between them and subsequent difficulty in communication. Interns in the Washington D.C. Intern-Mentor Teacher Program (District of Columbia Public Schools, 1987) reported they were threatened by the mentoring process, particularly by the evaluative role played by the mentor. Anxiety was expressed less frequently as the year progressed. This may reflect the finding of Hoffman et al (1985) that almost half of first-year teachers responding to a question about sources of influence on their teaching reported that evaluation was less influential at the end of their first year than at the beginning.

Evaluation of Induction Programs

Evaluations of both pre-1980 and post-1980 induction programs are unevenly and frequently unclearly reported. Descriptions of evaluations range from reports so vague it is not possible to determine exactly how data was gathered to reports which include samples and/or descriptions of

data-collection instruments. The state-mandated programs, as Andrews (1986) indicated, are thoroughly monitored and evaluated. Table 3 shows how evaluation data were collected for programs included in this review.

Insert Table 3 About Here

Questionnaires were used most often to collect evaluation data. They were used in all 11 pre-1980 programs; Zeichner (1979) indicated that five of the programs used this as the only data-gathering technique. I was unable to verify this from the information provided in program descriptions. Questionnaires were used to gather data in 10 of 12 post-1980 programs. Only one pre-1980 program utilized interviews to gather data. Zeichner found this a serious shortcoming since such data might confirm or contradict data gathered by questionnaires. He speculated that the high degree of user satisfaction reported might have been lower if interview data had been collected. Interview data was collected in 10 of 12 post-1980 programs. As Zeichner predicted, areas of dissatisfaction not reported in descriptions of earlier programs did emerge. However, user satisfaction remained a consistent outcome. It was impossible to determine the extent of formal classroom

observation in most programs. Three pre-1980 programs (Washington State, New York City, Alabama) documented use of formal classroom observation instruments; these were also the pre-1980 programs which utilized treatment and control groups. In the post-1980 programs, Klug (1988) used two treatment groups to judge the effectiveness of induction program structures; Crawford, McBee, and Watson (1984) and Gunter (1985) used naturally occurring treatment and control groups to study the effects of induction programs on induction and non-induction teachers; and Brouillet (1987) and Henry (1988) compared the perceptions of induction and non-induction teachers.

Discussion and Recommendations

An examination of the purposes, findings, and evaluations of pre- and post-1980 induction programs does not account for the differing conclusions about their effectiveness by Zeichner (1979) and Huling-Austin (1988). Even though the number of induction programs has proliferated since 1980, and state-mandated programs are a new phenomenon, the purposes, activities, and findings about induction programs in general have not changed.

Stern and Shepherd (1985), in synthesizing data from 17 studies of Oklahoma's Entry Year Assistance Program, noted that there were no accepted standard techniques, instruments, or patterns for study of induction programs, thereby restricting comparison and even reporting of results (p. 9). This observation can be extended to the review of induction programs outside Oklahoma. For instance, measures used to collect documentation of classroom performance of beginning teachers ranged from formal observation to asking the teachers how competent they perceived themselves to be.

This may account for the difference in interpretation of results by the two earlier reviewers. Evaluation data from the reports reviewed here do not show decisively that induction programs will achieve such purposes as improvement of teaching, teacher socialization, and professional

development. Results do seem to indicate a trend toward achievement of the goals, however. Furthermore, there are no longitudinal data to indicate that the trend continues beyond the induction year or that the programs contribute to the long-term retention of teachers. In view of what he terms "highly equivocal" findings, Zeichner (1982) is skeptical about focusing major efforts on the induction period unless they are linked to systematic efforts to change conditions affecting the development of all teachers. Huling-Austin (1988) believes these data support the assumption that certain induction practices or program components are likely to be successful in achieving the five goals she identifies. Huling-Austin (1986) has cautioned elsewhere, however, that it is important to clarify what can reasonably be expected from an induction program. Thus, while there is disagreement in interpretation of data on induction programs, there is no apparently disagreement between Zeichner and Huling-Austin that without attention to other aspects of teaching such as low salaries, bureaucratic control of professional activities, over-crowded conditions, lack of paraprofessional and clerical support, and other conditions, teacher induction programs are likely to have little long-lasting impact. In conjunction with other measures designed to improve and professionalize teaching,

however, they may contribute positively to the improvement and development of teachers.

In order for induction programs to aid the beginning teacher, program expectations must be realistic. Current programs can ease the transition into teaching and should be used to help create professional cultures of teaching. Purposes of induction programs and the theoretical framework in which they are grounded must be identified. A conspicuous shortcoming of induction program descriptions is lack of clarity about purposes. Commitment to the program at all levels of policy and budget decision-making must be carefully examined. Program expectations may need to be changed if resources that would make them attainable are not available. Unrealistic expectations will lead to program failure. Extent of commitment is immediately discernible in terms of the time and money allocated to implement a program.

One should be highly cautious in suggesting that teaching performance of beginning teachers is improved as a result of induction programs. In the first place, there is no universal agreement on what constitutes good or effective teaching and, in the second place, our ability to accurately measure it is problematic. Given the typical circumstances of teaching and the limited time typically devoted to

induction programs, equivocal results should not surprise a thoughtful person. At best, then, an induction program might highlight basic teaching skills needed by new teachers, provide help for immediate problems, facilitate acceptance into the school culture, and attempt to help create a climate which not only values, but nutures, on-going learning and improvement.

Furthermore, although the mentor is seen as the most effective element in induction programs, expectations for the mentor are frequently unrealistic. The role of the mentor should be examined carefully. It is greatly influenced by commitment of time and money to training and performance of duties. In these programs, criteria for choosing mentors are often not clearly defined. An unspoken assumption seems to be that a good teacher will be a good mentor. However, Thies-Sprinthall (1986) declares that task analysis reveals that the requisite skills for mentoring are even more complex than those for teaching. Research evidence from studies of student teachers indicates that not only can untrained supervision result in very little help, it can be miseducative. Untrained mentoring can be expected to have the same results. Persons chosen as mentors in the programs reviewed here, even those expected to participate in recommendation for permanent certification, were

typically given very little training (Barbee and Finley, 1985; Brouillet, 1987; Henry, 1988; Varah, Theune, & Parker, 1986; etc.). The prevalence of such superficial training calls into question the wisdom of asking mentors to provide instructional assistance. It surely indicates that expecting help from a mentor to lead to significant improvement in teaching performance is unrealistic, particularly within the limited time generally allotted for induction activities. When mentors are asked to provide the kind of assistance and/or evaluation typically expected of experienced supervisors, they should be trained to the same extent as any supervisor. Related to the use of mentors is the possibility, suggested by findings from several studies (Brouillet, 1987, 1988; Guerrero & Goldberg, 1988) and a stated goal of Project CREDIT (Henry, 1988a, 1988b), that serving in that role may lead to renewed motivation and professional growth for experienced teachers.

One must also be highly cautious in expectations for state-mandated induction programs. Hoffman et al. (1985) found that while these programs can have a positive effect on beginning teachers, at their worst they are "one more set of things the first-year teacher had to deal with" (p. 137). Therefore, mandated programs should attempt to ensure provision of support structures that will enable beginning

teachers to resolve common problems and move forward in professional development. The role of support personnel should be assistance; evaluation is a bureaucratic function rather than a professional responsibility. Programs based primarily on effective teaching research reflect what Griffin (1985, p.44) calls "an almost mystical reliance" by policy makers on such research as the basic foundation for beginning teacher programs and may lead to a narrow view of teaching. Research cited above (Crawford, McBee, & Watson, 1984; Gunter, 1985) shows that improved teaching skill, as defined by these programs, cannot be clearly demonstrated. Furthermore, it is not at all clear that these programs are serving the function of screening out incompetent teachers (Hoffman et al., 1985; Medley, Rosenblum, & Vance, 1989).

Klug's (1985) research corroborates the insight (Clift, Veal, Johnson, & Holland, 1989) that ways must be found for practitioners to develop and indicates that well-planned structures will facilitate such development.

Induction programs should be part of a continuum of professional development for all teachers. As such, they should be designed to move from a narrow focus on the instructional practices of the individual teacher to arouse positive concerns that might not otherwise surface. Existing structures in schools should be used to encourage

development of beginners and, at the same time, promote collegiality and collaboration among both novices and veterans. For instance, when a beginning teacher moves into a school where teams or departments have norms of working together, there might be several sources of help. At the same time, if the experienced teachers were exploring their own needs, development would be seen by the novice as continuous. If an experienced teacher were to be intensively trained in a clinical mentoring role and subsequently trained others, as in the model described by Thies-Sprinthall (1986), norms for peer and self-directed supervision might begin to evolve.

Finally, plans for evaluating the success of activities in achieving program purposes should be part of program development. Evaluation should also be the basis for change and should provide information over time. Clearly stated and realistic purposes based on an articulated theoretical framework should make it easier to design evaluations that will give more unequivocal answers to questions about program effectiveness. Both qualitative and quantitative data should be gathered. As Zeichner (1979) observed, and as the evaluations of post-1980 programs make clear, interviews with both beginning and experienced teachers are often useful in amplifying and clarifying other kinds of

data. However, care should be taken in any evaluation to augment perceptions of user satisfaction with more substantive data. Induction research should also investigate what conditions are most important to success for the beginning teacher and how induction programs can enhance them. While schools should draw on the research findings about effective induction programs, it is important for them to design programs that reflect their unique circumstances and the needs of the particular beginning teachers they wish to support.

References

Alabama State Department of Education. (1974). The first-year teacher pilot program: an interim report. Montgomery: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 102 141)

Andrews, I.H. (1986). An investigation of the academic paradigms underlying induction programs in five countries. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 269 400)

Applegate, J.H., Flora, V.R., Johnston, J.M., Lasley, T.J., Mager, G.M., Newman, K.K., and Ryan, K. (1977). The first year teacher study. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 135 766)

Barbee, J., & Finley, E. (1985). Vocational agriculture entry-year teachers' and entry-year assistance committee members' perceptions of the Oklahoma entry-year assistance program (HB1706). In M. Combs (Ed.), Implications for H.B. 1706. Proceedings of the Oklahoma Education Research Symposium II (pp. 43-53). Oklahoma City, OK: Oklahoma State Department of Education and Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 261 976)

Barger, R.N. (1986a). Survey of Illinois school districts for the initial year of teaching study. (Final report submitted to the Illinois State Board of Education per Contractual Service Agreement.) Charleston, IL: Eastern Illinois University, Center for Educational Studies. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 284 852)

Barger, R.N. (1986b). Survey of state departments of education for the initial year of teaching study. (Final report submitted to the Illinois State Board of Education per Contractual Service Agreement.) Charleston, IL: Eastern Illinois University, Center for Educational Studies. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 284 851)

Barnes, S. (1985). Preliminary findings of the teacher induction studies. In M. Combs (Ed.), Implications for H.B. 1706. Proceedings of the Oklahoma Education Research Symposium II (pp. 3-8). Oklahoma City, OK: Oklahoma State Department of Education and Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 261 976)

Barnes, S., & Huling-Austin, L. (1984). Model teacher induction project. Research design for a descriptive study (R&D Report No. 7200). Austin, TX: University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 263 104)

Blackburn, J.D. (1977). The first year teacher: perceived needs, intervention strategies and results. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 135 768)

Blackburn, J.D., & Crandall, J. (1975). Preliminary results of a first-year teacher pilot program: data analysis, interpretation, and projections. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 104 805)

Brooks, D. M. (Ed.) (1987). Teacher induction - a new beginning. Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Brooks, D.M. (1986a). Programmatic teacher induction: a model for new teacher professional development. Richardson, TX: Richardson Independent School District. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 278 625)

Brooks, D.M. (1986b). Richardson new teacher induction program. Final data analysis and report. Richardson, TX: Richardson Independent School District. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 278 627)

Brouillet, F.B. (1987). Report to the legislature on the beginning teacher assistance program (BTAP) 1985-86. Olympia, WA: Washington Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 277 657)

Brouillet, F.B. (1988). Report to the legislature on the beginning teacher assistance program. (Chapter 507, Laws of 1987). Olympia, WA: Washington Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 298 104)

Bullough, R.V. (1989). First-year teacher. A case study. New York: Teachers College Press.

Caldwell, M. (1986). Status report on the Virginia beginning teacher program. Charlottesville: University of Virginia, Bureau of Educational Research. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 271 622)

Champion, R., Newcombe, E., Meister, G., & Austin, S. (1988). Creation of a state initiative for improving local practices in new teacher induction: The Maryland story. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 298 117)

Combs, M. (1985). Teacher consultants: how do they impact upon beginning teachers? In M. Combs (Ed.), Implications for H.B. 1706. Proceedings of the Oklahoma Education Research Symposium II (pp. 39-41). Oklahoma City, OK: Oklahoma State Department of Education and Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 261 976)

Clift, R.T., Veal, M.L., Johnson, M., & Holland, P. (1989). Strengths and limitations of collaborative acttion research: implications for teachers' learning. Paper presented at the Conference on Collaborative Research in Teacher Education, Quebec City.

Conant, J.B. (1963). The education of American teachers. New York: McGraw Hill.

Crawford, J., McBee, M., & Watson, P. (1985). Evaluation of the entry-year assistance program. In M. Combs (Ed.), Implications for H.B. 1706. Proceedings of the Oklahoma Education Research Symposium II (pp. 25-32). Oklahoma City, OK: Oklahoma State Department of Education and Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 261 976)

District of Columbia Public Schools. (1985). Toward excellence in teaching. Intern mentor program. Washington, DC: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 267 017)

District of Columbia Public Schools. (1987). Incentive program for teachers. Washngton, DC: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 284 864)

Dooley, H.R. (1970). A program to strengthen the skills, understandings, and professional commitment of new teachers to work with poverty stricken Mexican-American pupils in South Texas schools. (Director's Report.) Edinburg, TX: Region One Education Service Center. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 045 564)

Elias, P., McDonald, F.J., Stevenson, C., Simon R., & Fisher, M.L. (1980). Study of induction programs for beginning teachers. Volume II. The problems of beginning teachers: a digest of helping programs (Contract No. 400-78-0069). Princton, NJ: Educational Testing Service. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 257 779)

Elsner, K. (1984). First year evaluation results from Oklahoma's entry-year assistance committees. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, New Orleans. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 242 706)

Fuller, F.F. (1969). "Concerns of teachers: a developmental conceptualization." American Educational Research Journal, 6(2), 207-226.

Godley, L.B., Klug, B.J., & Wilson, D.R. (1985). In M. Combs (Ed.), Implications for H.B. 1706. Proceedings of the Oklahoma Education Research Symposium II (pp. 11-18). Oklahoma City, OK: Oklahoma State Department of Education and Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 261 976)

Gold, M.J., & Pepin, B. (1987). Passing the torch: retired teachers as mentors for new teachers. New York: City University of New York, Center for Advanced Study in Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 286 863)

Griffin, G.A. (1985). "Teacher induction: research issues." Journal of Teacher Education, 36(1), 42-46.

Guerrero, F., & Goldberg, P. (1988). Mentor teacher internship program, 1986-87. OEA evaluation report. New York: New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, Office of Educational Assessmeant. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 300 380)

Gunter, M.N. (1985). A comparative study of participants and nonparticipants in the Florida beginning teacher program. Ft. Myers, FL: Florida Educational Research and Development Council, Inc. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 268 097)

Henry, M.A. (1988a). "Multiple support: a successful model for inducting first-year teachers." The Teacher Educator, 24(2), pp. 7-12.

Henry, M.A. (1988b). Project CREDIT. Certification renewal experiences designed to improve teaching. A cooperative multiple-support program for first-year teachers between Indiana University and ten public school districts. Terre Haute: Indiana State University, Department of Secondary Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 291 681)

Hirsh, S., & Brooks, D.M. (1986). New teacher induction model. An implementation guide. Richardson, TX: Richardson Independent School District. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 278 626)

Hite, F.H. (1968). Follow-up study: long-term effects of modified internship for beginning elementary teachers. Seattle, WA: School Information and Research Service. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 022 715)

Hite, F.H., Garrison, H.L., & Killian, G.P. (1966). Effects of reduced load and intensive inservice treatment upon the classroom behavior of beginning elementary teachers (Cooperative Research Project No. 2973). Olympia: Office of Washington State Superintendent of Public Instruction and Pullman: Washington State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 010 162)

Hoffman, J.V., Edwards, S.A., O'Neal, S.F., Barnes, S., and Paulissen, M.O. (1986). "A study of state-mandated induction programs." Journal of Teacher Education, 36(1), 16-21.

Hoffman, J.V., Griffin, G.A., Edwards, S.A., Paulissen, M.O., O'Neal, S.F., Barnes, S., & Verstegen, D.A. (1985). Teacher induction study: a final report of a descriptive study (Report No. 9063). Austin, TX: University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 270 443)

Honigman, F.K. (1970). An evaluation of the program "Supportive training for inexperienced and new teachers" (STINT) in New York City schools. New York: Institute for Educational Development. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 051 087)

Huffman, G., & Leak, S. (1986). "Beginning teachers' perceptions of mentors." Journal of Teacher Education, 36(1), 22-25.

Huling-Austin, L. (1986). "What can and cannot reasonably be expected from teacher induction programs." Journal of Teacher Education, 37(1), pp. 2-5.

Huling-Austin, L. (1987). Teacher induction as part of the larger picture. Proceedings of the 40th Annual Texas Conference on Teacher Education, Houston (pp. 32-46). Austin: Texas Education Agency.

Huling-Austin, L. (1988). A synthesis of research on teacher induction programs and practices. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 302 546)

Huling-Austin, L., Putman, S., & Galvez-Hjornevik, C. (1985). Model teacher induction project study findings. Final report (Report No. 7212). Austin: University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 270 442)

Hunt, D.W. (1968). "Teacher induction: an opportunity and a responsibility." Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, 52(330), 130-135.

Ishler, P. (1988). A report on successful teacher induction programs: the whys, whats, and wherefores for Texas. Paper presented at the 41st Annual Texas Conference on Teacher Education, Dallas. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 301 562.

Johnson, M. (1969). Model program for teacher in-service training emphasizing the affective dimension. Arlington Heights, IL: Elk Grove Training and Development Center. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 034 747)

Johnston, J.M. (1981). A knowledge base for teacher induction. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Detroit. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 198 142)

King, K.L. (1985). An assessment of Oklahoma's entry year assistance program: a report to the Oklahoma legislature. In M. Combs (Ed.), Implications for H.B. 1706. Proceedings of the Oklahoma Education Research Symposium II (pp. 35-38). Oklahoma City, OK: Oklahoma State Department of Education and Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 261 976)

Klug, B.J. (1988). Teacher induction in southeastern Idaho: preliminary report. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, San Diego. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 291 727)

Lawrence, D. (1985). "The Toledo plan for peer evaluation and assistance." Education and Urban Society, 17(3), 347-354.

Locke, W.E. (1987). New teacher induction plan developed for Wilmington High School. Wilmington, IL: Wilmington High School. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 020 067)

Marashio, P. (1971). "A proposal for helping the beginning teacher." Clearing House, 45(7), 419-421.

Marshall, F.G. (1982). Perceived effectiveness of induction practices by beginning teachers in public school districts in the greater Houston area. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Houston.

Maryland State Department of Education and Research for Better Schools, Inc. (1987). Perspectives on teacher induction: a review of the literature and promising program models. Baltimore and Philadelphia: Authors. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 288 857)

McDonald, F.J. (1980). Study of induction programs for beginning teachers. Volume I. The problems of beginning teachers: A crisis in training (Contract No. 400-78-0069). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 257 778)

McDonald, F.J., & Elias, P. (1983). The transition into teaching: The problems of beginning teachers and programs to solve them. Summary report (Contract No. 400-78-0069). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 257 777).

McGinnis, C. (1968). "The beginning teacher project in New York state." Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, 52(330), 44-48.

McNair, V., McGee, N., Timberlake, B., Hines, J., Reiman, A. (1987). Sweet rejuvenation: linking in-service and teacher induction. Raleigh, NC: Wake County Public School System. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 288 827)

Medley, D.M., Rosenblum, E.P., & Vance, N.C. (1989). "Assessing the functional knowledge of participants in the Virginia beginning teacher assistance program." Elementary School Journal, 89(4), 495-510.

Meister, G. (1987). Current practices in new teacher development in Maryland 1986-87. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools, Inc. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 291 711)

Noda, D.S. (1968). "Beginning teacher development in Hawaii. Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, 52(330), 62-73.

Oates, M. (1971). The mid-coast Maine project in the affective education of teachers. An evaluation. Newton, MA: Education Development Center, Inc. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 091 359)

Odell, S.J. (1986). "Induction support of new teachers: a functional approach." Journal of Teacher Education, 36(1), 26-29.

Odell, S.J. (1988). Characteristics of beginning teachers in an induction project. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 290 752)

Readling, J.J., Barone, V.I., & Schaffer, R.D. (1967). The Oswego plan for team supervision of beginning teachers. Oswego: State University of New York College at Oswego. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 029 850)

Ryan, K. (Ed.) (1970). Don't smile till Christmas. Accounts of the first year of teaching. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ryan, K. (Ed.) (1980). Biting the apple: accounts of first year teachers. New York: Longman.

Sacks, S.R., & Wilcox, K.K. (1988). Training retired teachers for the transition to mentoring. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans. (ERIC Document Rreproduction Service No. ED 294 840)

Scates, M. (1970). An evaluation of P.R.O.B.E. A program for the recruitment of beginning educators. Part I, Part II, Part III. Washington, DC: District of Columbia Public Schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 055 029)

Shea, J. (1982). The new Florida beginning teacher program. Gainesville: University of Florida. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 230 552)

Smith, D.C., & Wilson, G.W. (1984). The Florida beginning teacher program. Washington, DC: National Commission on Excellence in Teacher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 253 541)

Stern, A.K., & Shepherd, G.D. (1986). A synthesis of the research of Oklahoma's induction year program as a basis for policy considerations. Stillwater: Oklahaoma State University, College of Education, and Norman: University of Oklahoma, College of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 287 816)

Stern, A.K., & Wisley, S. (1985). Support and assistance provided first year teachers. In M. Combs (Ed.), Implications for H.B. 1706. Proceedings of the Oklahoma Education Research Symposium II (pp. 19-23). Oklahoma City, OK: Oklahoma State Department of Education and Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 261 976)

Swanson, P. (1968). "A time to teach - and a time to learn." Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, 52(330), 74-84.

Thies-Sprinthall, L. (1986). "A collaborative approach for mentor training: a working model." Journal of Teacher Education, 37(6), 13-20.

Theune, W.S., & Varah, L.J. (1983). Teacher induction - a program of assistance and support for first year teachers. Whitewater: University of Wisconsin-Whitewater. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 260 028)

Tisher, R.P. (1982). Teacher induction: an international perspective on research programs. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 213 687)

Varah, L.J. (1985). Teacher induction program. (An inservice program for first-year teachers). Whitewater: University of Wisconsin-Whitewater. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 265 150)

Varah, L.J., Theune, W.S., Parker, L. (1986). "Beginning teachers: Sink or swim?" Journal of Teacher Education, 37(1), 30-34.

Veenman, S. (1984). "Perceived problems of beginning teachers." Review of Educational Research, 54(2), 143-178.

Weber, J. (1987). The mentor program in the Scarsdale public schools. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of School Administrators, New Orleans. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 280 165)

Wildman, T.M., Niles, J.A., Magliaro, S.G., McLaughlin, R.A., & Drill, L.G. (1987). Virginia's colleague teacher project: focus on beginning teachers' adaptation to teaching. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C.

Wildman, T.M., Niles, J.A., Magliaro, S.G., McLaughlin, R.A. (1989). "Teaching and learning to teach: the two roles of beginning teachers." Elementary School Journal, 89(4), pp. 471-494.

Wilmette Public Schools. (1969). Program for beginning teachers. An individualized approach to in-service education. An application for continuation grant. Part II. Narrative. Wilmette, IL: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 036 458)

Zeichner, K.M. (1979). Teacher induction practices in the United States and Great Britain. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 272 456)

Zeichner, K.M. (1982). Why bother with teacher induction? In Hall, G.E. (Ed.) Beginning teacher induction: five dilemmas. Proceedings from a public forum (R&D Report No. 3153). Symposium conducted at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 251 444)

Zeichner, K.M. (1983). Individual and institutional factors related to the socialization of teaching. In G.A. Griffin & H. Hukill (Eds.) First years of teaching: what are the pertinent issues? Proceedings of a national working conference (R&D Report No. 9051). Austin: University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 240 109)

Figures and Tables

Figure 1

INDUCTION PROGRAMS REVIEWED

Pre-1980

1. THE WASHINGTON STATE MODIFIED INTERNSHIP FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS (Hite, Garrison, & Killian, 1966; Hite, 1968)

2. THE OSWEGO (NY) PLAN FOR TEAM SUPERVISION OF BEGINNING TEACHERS (Readling, Barone, & Schaffer, 1967; McGinnis, 1968)

3. THE NASSP PROJECT ON THE INDUCTION OF BEGINNING TEACHERS (Hunt, 1968; Swanson, 1968)

4. THE BEGINNING TEACHER DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM IN HAWAII (Noda, 1968)

5. THE WHEELING (ILL) MODEL PROGRAM FOR TEACHER IN-SERVICE TRAINING EMPHASIZING THE AFFECTIVE DIMENSION (Johnson, 1969)

6. THE WILMETTE (ILL) PROGRAM FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS (Wilmette Public Schools, 1969).

7. THE NEW YORK CITY SUPPORTIVE TRAINING PROGRAM FOR INEXPERIENCED AND NEW TEACHERS (Honigman, 1970)

8. THE SOUTH TEXAS NEW TEACHER ORIENTATION PROJECT (Dooley, 1970)

9. THE WASHINGTON, D.C. PROGRAM FOR THE RECRUITMENT OF BEGINNING TEACHERS (Scates, 1970)

10. THE SALEM (NH) PROGRAM FOR HELPING THE BEGINNING TEACHER (Marashio, 1971)

11. THE ALABAMA FIRST YEAR TEACHER PILOT PROGRAM (Alabama State Department of Education, 1974; Blackburn & Crandall, 1975; Blackburn, 1977)

Post-1980

1. THE FLORIDA BEGINNING TEACHER ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (Sher, 1982; Smith & Wilson, 1984; Edwards, 1984; Gunter, 1985; Hoffman et al., 1985; Paulissen, Salinas, & Barnes, 1985; Hoffman et al., 1986)

2. THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-WHITEWATER TEACHER INDUCTION PROGRAM (Theune & Varah, 1983; Varah, 1985; Varah, Theune, & Parker, 1986)

3. THE OKLAHOMA ENTRY YEAR ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (Elsner, 1984; Edwards, 1984; Combs (Ed.), 1985; Hoffman et al., 1985; Paulissen, Salinas, & Barnes, 1985; Stern & Shepherd, 1986; Godley, Wilson, & Klug, 1986)

4. THE MODEL TEACHER INDUCTION PROJECT (Barnes & Huling Austin, 1984; Huling-Austin, 1985; Huling-Austin & Emmer, 1985; Huling-Austin & Smith; 1985; Huling-Austin, Putman, & Galvez-Hjornevik, 1985)

5. THE WASHINGTON, D.C. INTERN-MENTOR TEACHER PROGRAM (District of Columbia Public Schools, 1985; District of Columbia Public Schools, 1987)

6. THE RICHARDSON (TX) NEW TEACHER INDUCTION PROGRAM (Brooks, 1986a; Brooks, 1986b; Hirsh & Brooks, 1986; Hirsh & Carr, 1986)

7. THE ALBUQUERQUE PUBLIC SCHOOLS/UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO TEACHER INDUCTION PROGRAM (Odell, 1986a; Odell, 1986b; Odell, Loughlin, & Ferraro, 1986; Odell, 1988)

8. THE VIRGINIA BEGINNING TEACHER ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (Dunleavy et al, 1983; Caldwell, 1986; Medley, Rosenblum, & Vance, 1989)/THE VIRGINIA COLLEAGUE TEACHER PROJECT (Wildman, Niles, Magliaro, McLaughlin, & Drill, 1987; Wildman, Niles, Magliaro, & McLaughlin, 1989)

9. THE WASHINGTON BEGINNING TEACHER ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (Brouillet, 1987; Brouillet, 1988)

10. THE NEW YORK CITY MENTOR TEACHER INTERNSHIP PROGRAM (Guerrero & Goldberg, 1988).

11. TEACHER INDUCTION IN SOUTHEASTERN IDAHO (Klug, 1988)

12. PROJECT CREDIT (Henry, 1988a, 1988b)

PROGRAM NAME	RELEASED TIME FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS	AN EXPERIENCED TEACHER/MENTOR	MENTORS GIVEN RELEASED TIME	MENTORS GIVEN SUPERVISORY TRAINING	INSTRUCTIONAL CONTACT WITH UNIV. PERSONNEL	INDIVIDUAL IN-CLASS ASSISTANCE	SEMINARS OR WORKSHOPS	A SPECIAL PRE-SERVICE ORIENTATION	OBSERVATIONS BY EXPERIENCED TEACHERS OR PEERS
Pre-1980									
WASH. STATE	X					X/I			X
MASSP	X	X	X			X	X	X	X
OSWEGO	X	X	X	X		X	X		X
HAWAII		X	X	X		X			
WHEELING	X						X		X
WILMETTE	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
NYC		X	X	X	X	X	X		
SOUTH TEXAS	X						X		X
WASH.D.C.	X						X	X	
SALEM		X				X	X		X
ALABAMA					X	X			
Post 1980									
FLORIDA		X			Possible				X
WISCONSIN		X			X			X	Unclear
OKLAHOMA		X			On Team				X
MTIP		X					X	Classrm.mgmt.	X
WASH.D.C.		X	X	X	Optional Courses	X	X	X	X
RICHARDSON					Workshops		x	x	
NEW MEXICO		X	X	X	Graduate Courses	X	X		X
VA. BATAP								Early Fall	
VA.COLLEAGUE	X	X	Unclear	X		Unclear	X		Unclear
WASH.STATE	X	X	X	X		Unclear	X	Optional	X
NYC	X	X	X	X		X	X		X
IDAHO		X	Unclear						X/I
PROJ. CREDIT		X		Unclear	X	X	X	X	X

TABLE 1: SUMMARY OF MAJOR SUPPORT ELEMENTS IN 23 BEGINNING TEACHER INDUCTION PROGRAMS
Adapted from Teacher Induction Practices in the United States and Great Britain, by Kenneth M. Zeichner
Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, 1979
ED 272 456

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PROGRAM NAME	IMPROVED TEACHING	TEACHER SOCIALIZATION	TEACHER DEVELOPMENT	RETENTION	MANDATES
Pre-1980					
WASH. STATE	X	X			
NASSP	X			X	
OSWEGO	X		X	X	
HAWAII	X		X		
WHEELING	X	X	X		
WILLAMETTE	X	X	X	X	
NYC	X	X		X	
SOUTH TEXAS	X	X		X	
WASH.D.C.	X	X	X		
SALEM	X		X		
ALABAMA	X				
Post 1980					
FLORIDA	X				X
WISCONSIN	X		X	X	
OKLAHOMA	X				X
MTIP	X	X	X	X	
WASH.D.C.	X		X	X	X
RICHARDSON	X	X	X	X	
NEW MEXICO	X		X	X	
VA.BTAP	X				
VA.COLLEAGUE	X	X	X		
WASH.STATE	X				
NYC	X		X	X	
IDAHO	X	X	X		
PROJ. CREDIT	X			X	

TABLE 2 SUMMARY OF PURPOSES OF 23 BEGINNING TEACHER INDUCTION PROGRAMS

Figure 2

ANDREWS' FIVE PARADIGMS FOR INDUCTION PROGRAMS

1. LAISSEZ-FAIRE

* absence of formal programming
* minimal mentor-protege relationship
* not a high priority for beginning teacher or staff development programming

---

2. COLLEGIAL

* informal supervisory relationship with experienced colleague
* in-service activities provided for both participants
* no assessment component enters into supervisory relationship

---

3. FORMALIZED MENTOR-PROTEGE

* formalized contractual relationship of beginning teacher with experienced teacher and mandated syllabus
* comprehensive inservice activities for both participants
* beginning teacher evolves through a continua from dependency on the mentor to professional independence
* assessment component part of mentor's role

---

4. MANDATORY COMPETENCY-BASED

* mandated performance-based competency program
* probationary status of beginning teacher emphasized
* major financial and legislative support
* well monitored and evaluated

---

5. SELF-DIRECTING PROFESSIONAL

* self-directing contract format
* may combine elements of paradigms 2, 3, 4
* mentor provides collaborative support
* beginning of on-going professional development plan

Note. Adapted from An Investigation of the Academic Paradigms Underlying Induction Programmes In Five Countries by Ian H. Andrews, 1986. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. San Francisco. ED 269 400

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PROGRAM NAME	SURVEYS, RATINGS, QUESTIONNAIRES	INTERVIEWS	FORMAL OBSERVATION	INFORMAL OBSERVATION	COMPARISON GROUPS	JOURNALS, LOGS, ACTIVITY REPORTS	AUDIO/VIDEO TAPES	STUDENT DATA	RETENTION DATA	OTHER
Pre-1980										
WASH. STATE	x		x		x					
NASSP	x									
OSWEGO	UNCLEAR, APPEARS TO BE QUESTIONNAIRE									
HAWAII	UNCLEAR, APPEARS TO BE QUESTIONNAIRE									
WHEELING	x			x				x		
WILMETTE	x		x	x						
NYC	x		x		x			x	x	x
SOUTH TEXAS	x								x	
WASH.D.C.	x									
SALEM	UNCLEAR, APPEARS TO BE QUESTIONNAIRE									
ALABAMA	x		x		x	x		x	x	
Post 1980										
FLORIDA	x	x	x	x	x	x			x	x
WISCONSIN	x	x			x					
OKLAHOMA	x	x	x	x	x	x		x		x
MTIP	x	x	x	x			x			
WASH.D.C.	x	x				x				
RICHARDSON	x	x					x			
NEW MEXICO	x					x				
VA.BTAP			x							
VA.COLLEAGUE		x				x	x			
WASH.STATE	x				x				x	
NYC	x	x			STUDENTS			x	x	
IDAHO		x	UNANALYZED	x	x	x				
PROJ. CREDIT	x			x	x					

TABLE 3: SUMMARY OF DATA COLLECTION METHODS FOR EVALUATION OF 23 BEGINNING TEACHER INDUCTION PROGRAMS